

Application S/N 10/786,945
Amendment Dated: November 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: June 2, 2006

CE12442JME

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 02 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 remain pending in the application, as claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,600 to Nickum (Nickum). In addition, claims 6, 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nickum in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132585 to Palermo, et al. (Palermo).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the electronic product includes a plurality of peripheral devices that selectively couple and decouple to the electronic host device and activate independently of the electronic host device when decoupled from the electronic host device and further activate and operate independently of one another in which each of the peripheral devices operates with its own separate and independent relationship with the electronic host device once decoupled. Independent claims 9, 10 and 16 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments can be found on page 2, paragraph 0004, lines 6-8. No new matter has been added in view of these amendments.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nickum or Palermo describe or show such the concept of a plurality of peripheral devices having separate relationships with the host device. In particular, Nickum never describes the cellular telephone (14) or the pager (16) having any sort of relationship with the portable computer (12) once the cellular telephone (14) or the pager (16) is decoupled from the portable computer (12). That is, Nickum consistently describes interaction between the portable computer (12), the cellular telephone (14) and the pager (16) as occurring when the three components

Application S/N 10/786,945
Amendment Dated: November 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: June 2, 2006

CE12442JME

are physically coupled to one another (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 34-43; col. 3, lines 24-33; and col. 5, lines 6-13). Even in this description, any interaction between the pager (16) and the portable computer (12) is done through the cellular telephone (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 5-15), as there is no interaction between the computer (12) and the pager (16) independent of the telephone (14).

Moreover, Applicants note that Nickum clearly states that two digital signal processors (42, 44) may be built in the cellular telephone (14) to assist in the control of the communication and power connection interfaces between the pager (16) and the cellular telephone (14), as well as between the cellular telephone (14) and the portable computer (12) (see col. 4, lines 57-62). Again, the pager (16) is completely dependent on the cellular telephone (14) to exchange information or receive power from the portable computer (12) when the pager (16) is coupled to the cellular telephone (14), which must be coupled to the computer (12). This configuration teaches away from any thought of both the cellular telephone (14) and the pager (16) having their own separate relationships with the computer (12) when they are decoupled.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 16 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing

Application S/N 10/786,945
Amendment Dated: November 2, 2006
Response to Office Action dated: June 2, 2006

NOV 02 2006

CE12442JME

the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: _____

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871